



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

fm

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,923	08/31/2001	Roy Chrisop	SLA 1050	2251
55286	7590	04/20/2006	EXAMINER	
SHARP LABORATORIES OF AMERICA, INC. C/O LAW OFFICE OF GERALD MALISZEWSKI P.O. BOX 270829 SAN DIEGO, CA 92198-2829			LAM, ANDREW H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/944,923	CHRISOP ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew H. Lam	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-14 and 17-31 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-14 and 17-31 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: an RCE filed on 03/03/06.
- Claims 1, 4-14, and 17-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 26-31 are new claims. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-14, 17-19, 21 and 23-25 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asai (U.S. Patent No. 5,663,805) hereinafter Asai.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Asai discloses in a multifunction peripheral (MFP) device (fig. 1, facsimile unit 100, which has a plurality of function such as print, scan, fax, therefore consider MFP) with a plurality of functions, a system for allocating random access memory (RAM), the system comprising: an user interface (fig. 1, operation panel 11, col. 6, lines 15-20); and, using the user interface (col. 3, lines 10-16) for selecting a percentage (col. 4, lines 39-61, allocating a certain percentage of memory to MFP function using the UI) of RAM allocating for an MFP function (col. 3, lines 10-16); an allocator (fig. 1, operation panel 11) to allocate the selected percentage of RAM (col. 4, lines 25-30) and, RAM allocated to the temporary storage of documents (col. 4, lines 10-15) for processing by the MFP in response to MFP functions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-14, 17-21 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asai in view of AuClair (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,670) hereinafter AuClair.

Regarding claim 29, Asai discloses the system of claim 14 wherein the user interface (col. 3, lines 10-16) is used to select the percentage of RAM allocated to the MFP function (col. 4, lines 39-61, allocating a certain percentage of memory to MFP function using the UI) selected from a group consisting of MFP components and where the components are selected from a group consisting of fax, scanner, printer, and copier components (col. 4, lines 10-25, the allocator allocates the memory between fax operation and printer operation).

Asai does not disclose expressly the system of claim 14, wherein memory is allocated based on document formats.

AuClair discloses the system of claim 14, wherein memory is allocated based on document formats (fig.1 system 100, block 122 shows the determination of the number of reused fonts in the font cache associated with the printer, i.e., fonts type are associated with document type. Typically, in PostScript and/or PCL emulation language printers, fonts are communicated to the printer according to the outlined, definitions of those fonts (col. 7, lines 34-39)).

Asai and AuClair combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of providing memory (RAM) allocation to functions of an MFP. At the time of the invention,

it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine allocation of memory for document formats as taught by AuClair with the overall system of allocating memory (RAM) to an MFP. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the system performance by allocation excess or unused memory (RAM) for document format, thereby overall efficiency of the printer is achieved. As such, the font cache management enabled by the system 100 of the present invention can have an important effect on the efficiency of the printer (AuClair, col.7 lines 48-58).

Regarding claim 17, the combination discloses the system of claim 29, wherein the user interface supplies prompts for selecting the percentage of RAM the allocation for a document format selected from the group including post script (PS) documents, printer control language (PCL) documents, tagged image file format (TIFF) documents, and portable document format (PDF) documents (AuClair, fig.1 system 100, block 122 shows the determination of the number of reused fonts in the font cache associated with the printer, i.e., fonts type are associated with document type. Typically, in PostScript and/or PCL emulation language printers, fonts are communicated to the printer according to the outlined, definitions of those fonts, AuClair, col. 7, lines 34-39). AuClair further states that the amount of memory allocated to the font cache can therefore have an important effect on the overall efficiency of the printer. As such, the font cache management enabled by the system 100 of the present invention can have an important effect on the efficiency of the printer (col.7 lines 48-58)).

Regarding claim 18, the combination discloses the system of claim 14 further comprising: an MFP front panel display; wherein the user interface is a graphical user

interface (GUI) to present RAM allocation options on the display (inherently touch screen allows the user to response to interface prompts and that it is a GUI); and, wherein the allocator allocates RAM for MFP functions in response to GUI prompts on the display (AuClair, col. 3, lines 39-45).

Regarding claim 19, the system of claim 18 further comprising: a computer workstation including a browser and a display (AuClair, fig. 4) that are networked-connected to the MFP (AuClair, col. 9, lines 25-50); and, wherein the user interface includes an embedded web server in the MFP, responsive to the computer workstation browser requests, to supply a GUI on the computer workstation display presenting RAM allocation options (AuClair, col. 9, lines 25-50).

Regarding claim 20, the combination discloses the system of claim 17 wherein the allocator operates within predetermined ranges to limit each RAM allocation (Asai, col. 4, lines 35-60, the ranges from 1%-50%, 50%-99%, etc.).

Regarding claim 21, the combination discloses the system of claim 17 wherein the interface presents a memory configuration table GUI cross-referencing MFP functions to their respective RAM allocations; and, wherein the allocator allocates RAM for MFP functions in response to the memory configuration table GUI (AuClari, shows in fig.3 a sample display of the configuration table cross-referencing memory allocation for the present invention functions).

Regarding claim 24, the combination discloses the system of claim 14 with continued reference to fig.3, a user may upload diskette 330 into a drive 340 included with or connected to IPS 12. Processor 345 of IPS 12 may then download to or upload

for a printer usage determinations and buffer size, duplicate buffer and recovered memory reassignment change parameter profiles and/or implementation schemes (AuClair, col. 9, lines 44-51).

Regarding claim 25, the combination discloses the system of claim 14 wherein a display list data storage location having a predetermined size (AuClair, col.10, line 30-31).

Regarding claim 26, Asai discloses in a multifunction peripheral (MFP) device (fig. 1, facsimile unit 100, which has a plurality of function such as print, scan, fax, therefore consider MFP), the system comprising: an allocator (fig. 1, operation panel 11) for the allocation of RAM, responsive to the user interface selection (col. 4, lines 25-30); and, RAM allocated to the temporary storage of documents (col. 4, lines 10-15) for processing by the MFP.

Asai does not disclose expressly a user interface to select the percentage RAM allocated to a document format.

AuClair discloses expressly a user interface to select the percentage RAM allocated to a document format (col. 7, lines 34-39).

Asai and AuClair combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of providing memory (RAM) allocation to functions of an MFP. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine allocation of memory for document formats as taught by AuClair with the overall system of allocating memory (RAM) to an MFP. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the system performance by allocation excess or unused memory (RAM) for

document format, thereby overall efficiency of the printer is achieved. As such, the font cache management enabled by the system 100 of the present invention can have an important effect on the efficiency of the printer (AuClair, col.7 lines 48-58).

Regarding claim 27, the combination disclose the system of claim 26 wherein the user interface selects the allocation of RAM for a document format selected from the group including post script (PS) documents, printer control language (PCL) documents, tagged image file format (TIFF) documents, and portable document format (PDF) documents (AuClair, fig.1 system 100, block 122 shows the determination of the number of reused fonts in the font cache associated with the printer, i.e., fonts type are associated with document type. Typically, in PostScript and/or PCL emulation language printers, fonts are communicated to the printer according to the outlined, definitions of those fonts, AuClair, col. 7, lines 34-39). AuClair further states that the amount of memory allocated to the font cache can therefore have an important effect on the overall efficiency of the printer. As such, the font cache management enabled by the system 100 of the present invention can have an important effect on the efficiency of the printer (col.7 lines 48-58).

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asai further in view of well known prior art.

Regarding claim 22, Asai discloses in a multifunction peripheral (MFP) device (fig. 1, facsimile unit 100, which has a plurality of function such as print, scan, fax, therefore consider MFP) with a plurality of functions, a system for allocating random access memory (RAM), the system comprising: an user interface (fig. 1, operation

panel 11, col. 6, lines 15-20); and, using the user interface (col. 3, lines 10-16) for selecting a percentage (col. 4, lines 39-61, allocating a certain percentage of memory to MFP function using the UI) of RAM allocating for an MFP function (col. 3, lines 10-16); an allocator (fig. 1, operation panel 11) to allocate the selected percentage of RAM (col. 4, lines 25-30) and, RAM allocated to the temporary storage of documents (col. 4, lines 10-15) for processing by the MFP in response to MFP functions.

Asai does not disclose expressly that a user must reboot the system in order for memory to assign to the proper components.

Official notice is taken that the concept and advantage of using reboot the system is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Asai and reboot the system, thereby the configuration or changes made to the RAM allocation in the MFP can be taken into effect once the system reboot.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Asai in view of Bitar et al (U.S.Patent No 6,353,844) hereinafter Bitar.

Regarding claim 23, Asai discloses Asai discloses in a multifunction peripheral (MFP) device (fig. 1, facsimile unit 100, which has a plurality of function such as print, scan, fax, therefore consider MFP) with a plurality of functions, a system for allocating random access memory (RAM), the system comprising: an user interface (fig. 1, operation panel 11, col. 6, lines 15-20); and, using the user interface (col. 3, lines 10-16) for selecting a percentage (col. 4, lines 39-61, allocating a certain percentage of

memory to MFP function using the UI) of RAM allocating for an MFP function (col. 3, lines 10-16); an allocator (fig. 1, operation panel 11) to allocate the selected percentage of RAM (col. 4, lines 25-30) and, RAM allocated to the temporary storage of documents (col. 4, lines 10-15) for processing by the MFP in response to MFP functions.

The Asai does not disclose expressly that a user can prioritize the MFP function in event of memory contention.

Bitar discloses that resources such as CPUs and memory can be allocated for each batch jobs (col. 11, line 32), wherein batch jobs within the critical batch job class are assigned higher priority than batch jobs within the non-critical batch job class (col. 13, lines 10-24). Critical job can borrow resources when needed to complete the job on time. In this way a system that employ this method can improves the response time and can complete the job faster, because of the more efficient use to the resources (col. 11, lines 45-48).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Asai as per teaching of Bitar because by allocating additional resources such as CPUs and memory to higher priority function would improve response time of the printer. Thus, achieving the objective of Asai, which is to optimize printing efficiency.

Regarding claims 4-13 and 28, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claims 17-25 and 29, since claims 4-13 and 28 discloses a method that corresponds to the system of claims 17-25 and 29, thus the

method is inherent in that it simply provides functionality for the structural implementation found in system claims 17-25 and 29.

Regarding claims 30 and 31, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claims 26 and 27, since claims 30 and 31 discloses a method that corresponds to the system of claims 26 and 27, thus the method is inherent in that it simply provides functionality for the structural implementation found in system claims 26 and 27.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-16, filed 03/03/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 4-14 and 17-25 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art references due to newly amended limitations as cited in claims 1, 14, 26 and 30.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew H. Lam whose telephone number is (571) 272-8569. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea Jan

4/10/06

K.Y.P.

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER